DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 462 TM 800 164

AUTHOR Berke, Iris; And Others
TITLE The Impact of State Mandated Evaluation Procedures upon the Educational Programs of Local School Districts in California.
INSTITUTION Stanford Univ., Calif. Stanford Evaluation Consortium.
SPONS AGENCY California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. Office of Program Evaluation and Research.
PUB DATE Feb 76
NOTE 88p.; Best copy available.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; Citizen Participation; Compensatory Education; Early Childhood Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Field Interviews; *Formative Evaluation; Instructional Development; Participant Satisfaction; Program Development; *Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; School District Spending; State Aid; *State School District Relationship; *State Standards
IDENTIFIERS California; Metaevaluation

ABSTRACT

Data were collected from 15 school districts in northern California to assess three state-mandated evaluation procedures: (1) a comprehensive program planning report; (2) a year-end report on expenditures and attainment of objectives; and (3) a monitor and review visitation whose purpose was to monitor program compliance, observe improvements in instruction and school administration, and assess participation by school staff and parents in educational decision making generally. The participating schools received funds from at least two of the following state or federal programs: Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Educationally Disadvantaged Youth, Early Childhood Education, and Bilingual Education. The planning report and the site visit improved participation and awareness among staff and active parents; these two procedures also influenced instruction and management. The expenditure report, however, had little impact: it was regarded primarily as a requirement for further funding, but not perceived to be as helpful as the other two procedures. The state-mandated evaluation focused school site planning on the total educational program of the school, rather than on individual funding sources. (The site-visit interview form and the detailed questionnaire preceding the visit are appended). (CP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED186462

TM800 164

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE IMPACT OF STATE MANDATED EVALUATION PROCEDURES UPON THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS OF LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN CALIFORNIA

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
David W. Gordon
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Iris Berke
Elaine French
Susan Heck
Michael Kirst
Stephen Weiner

Stanford Evaluation Consortium

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

February, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface ii

Acknowledgements. iii

Summary 1

I. Study Design and Methodology. 6

II. Origin of State Required Evaluation Procedures. 12

III. Impact of Evaluation Procedures Upon Local Educational Programs. 16

IV. Analysis and Recommendations for Procedural Changes 35

V. Policy Implications 39

APPENDICES

A. A-1: Cover Letter. 43

A-2: Mailed Evaluation Questionnaire 45

B. Interview Questionnaire (local level) 57

C. Interview Guide (state level) 72

D. Explanation of State-mandated Evaluation Requirements (A-127, E-127, and Field Visits) 75

E. Explanation of ECE Evaluation Procedures and Ranking Formula (with timeline for completion of separate requirements) 81

PREFACE

In the fall of 1974, Dr. Alexander Law, Chief of the Office of Program Evaluation and Research of the California Department of Education asked members of the Stanford Evaluation Consortium* to assess the impact of evaluation procedures required by the State Department of Education upon the educational programs of local school districts. This report presents the findings of the study undertaken in response to that request.

Section I of the report describes the initial formulation of the research question as well and the procedures used to select a sample of school districts and to gather information in local districts and within the state department.

Section II describes the origin and nature of the evaluation procedures and activities required of local districts by the department.

Section III indicates how the nature of the questions under study evolved during the course of our inquiry and presents the major findings.

Sections IV and V summarize our conclusions and the policy implications which we see as resulting from our findings and conclusions.

This study was originally directed by Professor Michael Kirst. Professor Kirst terminated his direction of the study of the project upon his appointment to the State Board of Education in February, 1975. After that time he continued as a consultant to the study and Professor Stephen Weiner assumed responsibility for the completion of the work.

---

*The Stanford Evaluation Consortium is a group of Stanford University faculty members and graduate students interested in the use of evaluation techniques in the conceptualization and mangement of social programs. The Consortium's membership is drawn from the School of Education and the Departments of Communication, Psychology, Sociology and Statistics. The basic work of the Consortium is supported by the Russell Sage Foundation. The Consortium encourages its members to conduct research for outside sponsors on subjects related to evaluation. While the Consortium provides review mechanisms for sponsored research, the final responsibility for such work is that of the individuals involved.

SUMMARY

Nature of the Study

In late 1972, three new state educational programs were enacted: Early Childhood Education (ECE), SB 90--Educational Disadvantaged Youth (EDY), and State Bilingual Education (AB 2284). In administering these programs along with existing federal programs, the State Department of Education established a consolidated program management approach for both state and local levels, and mandated three major planning and evaluation procedures at the school level.

The three planning and evaluation examined procedures are:

1. The requirement both for carrying out a comprehensive planning process at the school level and for reporting the major ingredients to the state (A-127). The planning includes needs assessment, setting objectives with evaluation procedures, and designing program strategies and procedures, along with budgeting of special program funds.
2. The requirement for year-end reporting on the expenditure of funds, the attainment of objectives and the academic progress of program participants (E-127P).
3. The Monitor and Review (MAR) visitation to schools to review program compliance and assess the quality of program implementation.

To analyze the data collected from 31 interviews in 15 northern California school districts, it was useful to identify four aspects of school programs:

a. Instructional practices. This aspect of educational program refers to discrete instructional practices observable in the classroom.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to express our appreciation to the Office of Program Evaluation and Research (OPER) of the California Department of Education for their financial support of this study. Both OPER and program staff within the department provided full access to their files and, most important, wise counsel. School district and school site personnel of the fifteen participating local districts were both cordial and helpful, in spite of our study's demands upon them at their busiest time of year. We have also relied on the advice of the staff of the San Mateo County Office of Education and Evaluation Improvement Project, under whose auspices the study was conducted. Finally, colleagues in the Stanford Evaluation Consortium have kindly read our report and offered useful comments.

b. Management practices. This aspect includes decisions about classroom staffing patterns, recordkeeping, and local budgets.

c. Participation patterns. This aspect includes practices concerning who is encouraged and allowed to participate in educational decisionmaking.

d. Awareness of educational practices. This category encompasses attitudes, knowledge, values and self-consciousness evinced by program participants.

Major Findings

Our study revealed that the comprehensive school planning and evaluation process initiated through the ECE effort has had a demonstrable impact on the quality of local school planning, program development, program implementation, and program evaluation.

Specifically, we found that:

- The Comprehensive Planning and Evaluation Process (A-127 and E-127P) and the Monitor and Review site visitations generated new and broader patterns of school staff and parent participation in school planning, program implementation and program evaluation.
- The Planning Process and Monitor and Review site visitations have generated significant changes from prior school practices in that they require both the preparation of a written planning document as well as personal, on-site review and feedback from state staff on the quality of the local school program.
- The Comprehensive Planning and Monitor and Review processes appeared effective in that they provided rapid feedback on

program quality to a broad-based group of staff and parents on concrete steps that could be undertaken to improve the school's instructional program.

- The Planning Process and Monitor and Review site visitation appeared to have considerably more impact on a school's program development than did the E-127P evaluation document. This apparently is due to the fact that the first two devices provided more immediate useful feedback to local schools than did the evaluation document.
- Linking successful ratings on the school's planning procedures and Monitor and Review site visitation to the future allocation of additional funds to each school district appeared to provide a meaningful incentive for schools to plan, implement and refine comprehensive instructional programs.
- While we had initially expected that state mandated evaluation procedures would have their greatest effect on district level (central office) managers, we found instead that their sharpest impact was at the local school site, particularly with regard to the effectiveness of the process in encouraging school staff and parents to come together to plan and implement each school's program.
- Our investigation revealed an increasing awareness on the part of those involved at the school site (school staff, parents, etc.) concerning comprehensive strategies for design, implementation, and evaluation of instructional programs.

Policy Implications

Based on our findings, we recommend that the State Department of Education continue its efforts to refine procedures and explore new

strategies in the following areas:

- o Impact of state-mandated planning, monitor and review, and evaluation procedures:

  We recommend that the SDE further examine the school level planning process and the Monitor and Review site visitations in local schools in order to refine these successful processes for potential incorporation in future state education reform efforts.

- o Further examination of the most effective "mix" of evaluation data:

  It appears that both process and achievement data are and will continue to be useful and necessary. In further developing and refining the "mix" of required evaluation information, we recommend that the SDE carefully assess the needs of the various consumers of evaluative information and attempt to balance evaluation resources and requirements accordingly. In addition, we recommend that the SDE continue its efforts to clearly articulate the uses and findings of different types of evaluative data to the various consumers of the information.

- o Further exploration of the impact of reform incentive funding strategies:

We suggest that the ECE method of granting funds on a competitive, incentive basis be further examined and refined. We found that this strategy helps insure that districts seeking funds will comply with requirements set by the SDE. However, a point of diminishing returns may be reached in districts whose educational policy is incompatible with ECE program goals. Districts may also refuse to participate in ECE if state funds are not perceived to be worth the local time to complete ECE paperwork.

We recommend that the SDE attempt to examine the effects of incentive funding strategies in greater depth so that other proposed reform efforts (i.e., Reform of Intermediate and Secondary Education) may benefit from the SDE's experience with ECE. In light of potential difficulties with "diminishing returns" as reform efforts expand toward participation of all California schools, we also recommend that the SDE explore alternative methods to renovate or rejuvenate incentives in order to maintain the momentum for reform.

I. STUDY DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

A. Introduction

To assess the impact of evaluation procedures required by the State Department of Education upon the educational programs of local school districts, we examined: 1) evaluation requirements for Early Childhood Education, Bilingual Education, and two compensatory education programs, 2) how the evaluation requirements evolved within the SDE in recent years, 3) how the existing requirements are fulfilled at the local level, and 4) how both state and local respondents perceived the intended purpose and actual effect of the evaluation requirements.*

Initially we assumed that the greatest impact of evaluation at the local level would be at those points in the local district organizational structure where responsibility for the management of state and federal programs is lodged. Because we assumed that evaluation impact would be at the "program level" it was also logical to assume that impact would vary according to the nature of individual programs. We chose to concentrate our inquiry on the local impact of evaluations conducted for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Educationally Disadvantaged Youth provisions of SB-90, Early Childhood Education, and AB 2284 (Bilingual Education) Programs. The funding for Title I is provided by the federal government; the other three programs are state funded. Each program has guidelines for the conduct of evaluations for the purposes of local management and to provide data to the department. We expected that the

---

*Because this report is primarily intended for readers familiar with state educational programs and their associated evaluation processes, the programs and evaluation procedures are not described in detail within the main body of the report. However, more detailed information on both subjects can be found in the Appendices.

impact of evaluation would be related to the nature of the state evaluation requirements for each program and the level of program funding provided for each district. This led us to examine a sample of school districts which varied in their degree of participation in the four programs, as well as the nature of evaluation requirements and the number of categorical programs existing in each district.

We reasoned that evaluative impact would depend on the existence of local evaluation resources and the degree of local sophistication in the field of evaluation. Lacking an obvious and easily available indicator of local evaluation resources and sophistication, we decided to sample districts according to average daily attendance (ADA). Larger districts presumably would be capable of greater division of labor, hence, more likely to have specialized evaluation staffs.

B. Methodology

Local Level

We sought to approximate a stratified random sample of 15 school districts from among those in the eight counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, Monterey, San Benito, San Joaquin, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz) served by the San Mateo Evaluation Improvement Project. The sample represented 10 percent of the population of 142 of the 158 school districts.* The population included elementary and unified school districts which received funds from two, three, or four of the follow funding sources: Title I of ESEA, SB-90-Educationally Disadvantaged Youth, ECE, and Bilingual Education.

*Sixteen high school districts were not included because they generally do not receive funding for the programs under consideration.

The chart below illustrates the distribution of the population according to our selection criteria.

Number of Programs within District		TYPE OF DISTRICT Elementary		Unified		Totals	
ECE) Title I) AB-2284) SB90-EDY)	4	4		8		12	8.5%
ECE) Title I) SB90-EDY)	3	73		33		106	74.6%
ECE) Title I)	2	23		1		24	16.9%
Totals		100	70.4%	42	29.6%	142	100.0%

Figure 1. Distribution of Population by Number of Programs and Type of District

The decision to use the school district as the basic sampling unit resulted in the predominance of middle-sized (around 10,000 ADA) and small (under 10,000) ADA districts in the sample. Although most districts within the state are of this size, small and medium-sized districts do not contain a majority of students, nor do they receive the greatest amount of supplemental funding.

Initially, we selected ten school districts at random. After they agreed to participate, we chose the remaining five from among districts of over 10,000 ADA. Not all of the larger districts that had been randomly selected agreed to participate. We did find five larger districts willing to cooperate, but they were not randomly selected. In any event, generalization of findings to

the state as a whole must be viewed with caution, as all districts included in the study are within eight northern California counties. The following chart describes the sample by number of programs and ADA.

ADA	4 Programs	3 Programs	2 Programs
Under 500		1 (E)	1 (E)
1000-4999		3 (E)	
5000-9999	1 (E)	3 (E)	
10,000-14,999	1 (U)	1 (U) 1 (U)	
15,000-19,000			
20,000-24,999		1 (E)	
25,000-29,999			
30,000-34,999		1 (U)	
over 35,000	1 (U)		

Figure 2. Characteristics of Sample by Number of Programs and ADA (with type of district indicated in parenthesis: E = Elementary; U = Unified)

We gathered information through a mailed questionnaire (Appendix A) and 31 personal interviews with people designated as being responsible for conducting evaluation in the school district central offices, at school sites,

and one person at a County Office of Education. The title and other duties of these staff members varied considerably from district to district, depending on internal district office organization, size of district, and other factors. In some districts we met with superintendents, directors of evaluation and research, curriculum specialists, school psychologists, external consultants, and directors of compensatory programs. The following chart details the titles of our respondents.

	LOCATION		
	District Office	School Site	County Offices
Superintendent	3		
Associate/Assistant Superintendent	3		
Director of Evaluation and Research	4		
Director of Specially Funded Programs	2		
Title I and ECE Coordinators	2	4	
Director of Elementary Education	1		
Curriculum Coordinator	4		
School Psychologist	1		
External Consultant	1		
County Office of Education Staff Member (responsible for completing county cooperative evaluation)			1
Principal		2	
Vice-principal		1	
ECE Resource Teacher		1	
Director of Bilingual Education		1	
	21	9	1

Figure 3. Respondents Responsible for Evaluation

A questionnaire (Appendix A) was mailed prior to scheduling interviews. Because many districts failed to respond to the questionnaire, or answered only a portion of our questions, we did not conduct a numerical analysis of the questionnaire data. However, some data from the questionnaires returned was used in preparation for interviews. Findings presented in Section III are based on the 31 interviews.

Responses to each category on the interview questionnaire (see Appendix B) were tallied and aggregated for school and district respondents, both separately and combined. We found, however, that numerical tallies often did not communicate the respondents' views. For example, during the interview, we asked, "Do you think the information in the 1973-1974 E-127P (or any other evaluation document) had any direct or indirect effect on how the program was run the following year? If so, how?" (Question 3, Appendix B, p. 8) The responses divided evenly between "yes" and "no." The "no" responses were usually followed by a discussion of the time necessary to complete state-required evaluation forms, clearly indicating that the respondent was referring to the E-127P. On the other hand, the "yes" responses were often followed by remarks about usefulness of long-term planning and the process of teachers working together to plan educational goals and activities. These latter answers referred to the A-127 planning process. Thus, we found that analysis of the explanations was more fruitful than analysis of numerical tabulations.

We made careful checks for internal consistency within and across interviews. One of the three members of our study team conducted interviews at any school site and its district office. To minimize the effect of possible interviewer bias, no finding is presented which was not agreed upon by all interviewers, nor is an effect discussed unless all researchers recognized it as true of the districts with which they are most familiar.

State Level

In order to obtain background information, we interviewed nineteen members of the State Department of Education (see Appendix C). We met with staff responsible in 1973-75 for the direction and evaluation of Title I, EDY, ECE, and Bilingual Education, and members of MAR and regional service teams. We also interviewed those responsible for the development of the MAR compliance and quality assessment instruments, the A-127, the E-127P and the ECE expansion criteria, and staff responsible for compiling annual evaluation reports to the Legislature. Our interviews with department personnel provided insight into recent internal reorganizations, the department's changing role with regard to local school districts, its use of evaluation data provided by local districts, and its procedures for assisting and auditing program implementation and evaluation at the local level. This information provided context for our assessment of variation in evaluation impact across districts.

II. ORIGIN OF STATE-REQUIRED EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Analysis of the impact of state-mandated evaluation procedures on the educational programs of local school districts requires an understanding of the context in which such procedures were developed. Findings at the local level cannot be adequately understood without reference to the procedures, policies, and requirements developed by the State Department of Education in carrying out its direct responsibilities for state programs and serving as the intermediary for federal aid to local school districts.

The relationship between the department and local districts is one of mutual dependence. The department is dependent upon the districts for effective utilization of state aid and for the political support necessary

to maintain and expand educational budget allocations. The local districts depend on the department for legal interpretations, technical assistance, management of categorical aid programs, and representation of the interests of elementary and secondary education in the Capitol.

Within this context of interdependence, the nature and extent of evaluation in California's educational system have undergone considerable change within the last several years. The greatly increased state role in financing educational programs at the local level and changes in the nature of state interventions in local districts are largely responsible for the increased attention to evaluation. The number of state interventions, including SB-90, ECE, Miller-Unruh reading program, and bilingual programs, now begins to rival the range of federal categorical programs. The growth of the state role means that the State Department of Education serves as more than a conduit for federal categorical funds; important decisions about the magnitude and nature of categorical financial aid are now being made in Sacramento as well as in Washington.

Evaluation of the programs which the department administers has increased in importance correspondingly. The results of evaluation reports prepared by the department are used as evidence in legislative debates and gubernatorial decisions regarding budget allocations for educational programs. Due to the increased politicization of evaluation findings, local educators have become very aware of the use of evaluation by the department, the Legislature and the Governor.

The Department also intends evaluation findings to be useful to administrators, teachers and parents who are responsible for administering and implementing educational programs at the local level.

The department's program branch is responsible for the implementation and administration of categorical programs. Until recent reorganization,

the program branch was organized largely along lines dictated by the existence of various funding sources at the state and federal levels. However, within the past few years the program branch has been restructured along age-span (elementary, secondary, adult education) lines. In part, the reorganizations have been intended to reduce the confusion experienced by local school districts when they were required to interact with state administrative staffs divided according to funding sources. Under the currently evolving structure, local districts are able to work with teams of department officials, assigned from the age-span divisions, who are able to provide a more coherent presentation and interpretation of state guidelines and requirements.

As part of its management functions, the program branch conducts evaluations both by rating a school's educational plan (A-127) and by conducting on-site visits for compliance review and quality assessment of program implementation. For schools participating in the Early Childhood Education (ECE) program, the quality assessment is a major factor in the final rating which determines a district's eligibility for expansion funding.

In an attempt to provide evaluations of programs independent of the program branch itself, a separate Office of Program Evaluation and Research (OPER) was created in 1971. The OPER administers an additional evaluation procedure, the year-end summative evaluation (E-127), whose contents are also considered in determining the awards of competitive program funds, particularly for ECE. Further, data contained in the E-127 reports form the core of the information reported to the Legislature, on an annual basis, in reports prepared by OPER.

Thus, both the program branch and OPER conduct evaluation activities which have direct impact on local districts. The evolving nature of important new state programs, (such as SB90-EDY and ECE), imperfect coordination between the program branch and OPER, and frequent organizational shifts within the program

branch have all contributed to a measure of confusion at the local district and site levels concerning the nature and purpose of state-mandated evaluation procedures. We will discuss this issue again in our recommendations section.

After two years of planning, the consolidated application form was designed and implemented by the program branch, in part as a response to a legislative resolution (ACR 127/69) that arose from local district discontent over the proliferation of program application paperwork and overlapping planning processes for each categorical program.* The E-127 was developed after the A-127 by OPER staff to enable districts to collect and report required evaluation information in a single form for all A-127 programs. These consolidations in planning and evaluation are important for two reasons.

First, they manifest recognition by the department of the existence of a single educational program at the school site that combines the multiplicity of categorical and special program funds which the school may receive. Second, the A-127 and E-127 procedures are an attempt to institutionalize a cooperative and systematic planning process within each local district. The completion of the A-127 requires cooperation among administrators, teachers and parents, and it demands that these groups analyze the needs of pupils and design appropriate educational means of satisfying those needs and evaluating the resulting program.

The ECE program, passed by the Legislature in 1972 and implemented in 1973-74 school year, is the clearest manifestation of the department's attempts to reform its own mangement and to stimulate school site change. Rather than being intended as a specified instructional program, ECE is intended to be a process of planning, participation, and evaluation conducted at the individual

---

*In the 1973-74 school year local districts applied for state allocations for Title I and II of ESEA; the Miller-Unruh reading program; the Special Teacher Employment Program; the State Preschool program; ECE; SB-90 and AB-2284 (bilingual education) through the A-127 procedure.

school site. Parents and school staff formulate and pursue school level objectives within broad educational components required by the department. The incentive structure designed by the department to reward districts with successful ECE programs requires planning and process evaluation (A-127 plan ratings and MAR visits) as well as "product" evaluation on the extent to which schools have attained their objectives (the E-127P). Most important, the evaluation rating of schools in a district by the department determines whether that district will receive expansion funding for all other schools. The department's commitment to conduct on-site audits of all first year ECE schools represents a substantial change in the relationship between local school districts and the department. Thus, the department seeks to simultaneously maintain greater accountability over funding programs in local school districts, while encouraging school site personnel, and parents to take greater responsibility and initiative in program planning, implementation, and evaluation.

Departmental reorganization, consolidation of state level requirements for planning and evaluation at the local level, and new modes of state intervention at the school site all form a major element of the context in which the local impact of state-mandated evaluation must be examined.

III. THE IMPACT OF EVALUATION PROCEDURES UPON LOCAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Introduction

The initial study design assumed that the impact of evaluation procedures would depend upon the specific evaluation requirements associated with each of the four supplemental funding sources under study and would vary with the existence and sophistication of local evaluation staff.

These assumptions were plausible. But, in retrospect, they failed to anticipate the major features of evaluative impact that we discovered at the

local level. In this introductory section to the presentation of findings at the local level, we shall describe those factors that caused our original assumptions to be inappropriate as a framework for analysis. We shall also outline the revised definitions of educational program and evaluation that did prove useful as a means of organizing and analyzing the data resulting from interviews at the local district and school site level.

Each of the four supplemental funding sources is a separate legal and fiscal reality at the state level. However, these programs are not operationally distinct at the school site and classroom levels. Each program contributes resources and imposes constraints at the individual schools which participate. But both the added resources and guidelines are ingredients that are added to the ongoing instructional program at each school. Thus, teachers and local administrators cannot identify a separate "Title I program" or "ECE program" in the context of their school. Rather, local administrators and teachers can identify shifts, often of a subtle nature, that each new funding source has stimulated at the district and school site level. Thus, the reality at the school site is not that each supplemental funding source is administered separately, but rather that the school program, with the added resources provided by those sources, is managed as a whole.

The thinking and practice of administrators and teachers amalgamates all of the school's financial resources into one overall program. Such amalgamation was undoubtedly present in some instances before the advent of the A-127 procedure and the ECE program. However, the ECE concept of school site instructional planning, program implementation, and evaluation as embodied in the A-127 has encouraged school staff and parents to think in terms of an overall program rather than devoting compartmentalized attention to the various funding sources that flow into the school district budget.

Thus, it is more realistic to inquire into the impact which evaluation has upon the management of school programs as distinct from the impact of evaluative information as the management of supplemental funding sources from which the school receives funds.

Similarly, it is difficult to separate the evaluation efforts mounted on the initiative of the local district from the evaluation work done at the specific behest of the state and federal governments. Although local districts undertake some evaluations on their own initiative, this purely local effort is minimal when compared to the expenditures of time and money caused by local desires to meet the evaluation requirements of state and federal programs. Few districts, except the largest, have trained evaluators on their staff.* Program evaluation is often conducted by school site personnel who also carry out other duties.

It became necessary to focus our search for evaluative impact on a broader definition of educational program, a definition that went beyond the bounds of individual categorical efforts. As we examined our data it was found that impact on a school's educational program could be productively separated into four aspects:

1. Instructional practices. This aspect of educational programs refers to discrete practices observable in the classroom including matters of curriculum, methods of instruction, age and ability grouping of students, teacher's use of paraprofessionals and aides in the classroom and testing procedures.

---

*The sample of districts in our study did not include any of the major urban districts in California, such as San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Oakland, or San Jose. Our conclusions concerning the paucity of "local" evaluation might well require revision if these larger districts were taken into account.

2. Management practices include decisions about classroom staffing patterns, recordkeeping techniques, and rules and practices which affect the allocation of financial resources.
3. Participation patterns. This aspect of program includes practices governing the nature of those allowed to engage in educational decisionmaking and the roles such individuals and groups play.
4. Awareness of educational practices encompasses attitudes, knowledge, values and self-consciousness evinced by program participants.

As the study proceeded it also became evident that the impact of evaluation extended to practices which are not ordinarily referred to as evaluation by administrators or teachers. Thus, practices which are more often termed "planning" or "technical assistance" involved systematic efforts to gather data as a means to teach retrospective judgments about the worth of educational practices. We took notice of evaluative impact wherever such systematic steps were undertaken. As a result, it became useful to organize the examination of evaluative impact around the three major interventions conducted by the state, the A-127 procedure, the MAR visits, and the E-127 procedure.

A-127 Procedure*

Effect on Instructional Practices

In order to write the school level A-127 plan, school staff and parents must set goals and select activities to achieve those goals in all the educational components included in the A-127 form (language development, reading, math, health and auxiliary services, parent participation and community

*See Appendix D for a description of the A-127 planning process.

bilingual education as needed, and an optional component). They must select specific curricula, decide how much time to devote to each activity, determine how they will evaluate the success of various activities, and make budget decisions. This joint planning encourages teachers to think of the "total educational program" of the school rather than of what each individual teacher will do with his or her class. The process also encourages teachers to consider the relationship of educational goals for one grade to those of the grades preceding and following.

Respondents told us that faculty and parents modified their plans after experience with program implementation and evaluation. Thus, the process of writing the A-127 made those involved with the educational program more aware of the interrelatedness of various aspects of the program and their effects on students, as well as the benefit of ongoing evaluation for internal program improvement.

Effect on Management Practices

The A-127 plan affected management at the school site and the district office. At the school site, the plan reportedly served to keep attention distributed among all the educational components so that the cognitive goals did not receive an undue share of emphasis. One program director reported:

> We know from the beginning that we have to work on health screening, parent participation, staff development, and the rest, because we all wrote it (the A-127). We can't spend all year on math and reading.

Also at the school level, the plan focused attention on evaluation techniques to be used to assess the degree of program implementation and progress toward achieving goals. School people chose among several different standardized tests to measure student outcomes, whereas formerly teachers had little

or no choice. Several respondents reported that they and their school advisory committees developed their own means of assessing success in the areas of parent education, parent participation, staff development, and auxiliary services when they felt that "head counts" at meetings or lists of numbers of library books were inadequate evaluations. Many respondents reported developing new criterion-referenced tests when they began writing educational "continuums" in the subject areas. Thus, planners considered how to measure movement toward achieving goals they had set, and the notion of evaluation became embedded into the program. The plan, then, plays an important role in the school and district's management procedures.

At both the school and district level, changes in recordkeeping practices were made in response to the requirements of the programs applied for in the A-127. Information on non-cognitive components of the educational program had to be gathered and evaluated, including goals and objectives specified for each component, activities to be conducted in order to achieve those objectives, and methods of evaluating attainment of the specified objectives. Process as well as summative evaluation information had to be kept for both cognitive and non-cognitive aspects of the program. Thus, considerably more paperwork recording new kinds of information about the educational program was required.

At the district level, the plan affected hiring and staff utilization patterns. One district reported firing highly paid specialists and hiring lower-paid "diagnostic technicians" who worked closely with the classroom students. In some districts, giving greater responsibility to the school sites resulted in the creation of a new job, the on-site "Program Manager". Larger districts may employ "Program Coordinators" to oversee operations in several schools.

Thus, the planning process has necessitated reorganization and change in school and district management procedures in the areas of scheduling, recordkeeping, and staff utilization.

Effect on Participation Patterns

The process of assessing needs, declaring goals, and devising objectives preceded the writing of the A-127. Teachers, parents, community members, and some district personnel participated in the process. Many of the participants in the planning process had not formerly been involved in educational decision-making. One rural superintendent said,

> It (the planning process) has forced teachers and administrators to sit down together and plan a program. This was done in very few schools before. Here, they've sat down, as we've done this last month or so, and thought of the correct wording, and come up with ideas. They had to think it out, and write it down, and in the process, they've become involved again, and began planning both short and long range, and it's kind of exciting.

Schools and districts reported working to involve parents and community members not only in the classroom activities, but in the decisionmaking process as well. We were told of various practices used by schools to encourage parent participation. Some provided baby-sitting for preschool children, some instituted coffee-klatches to attract parents to the school to talk to each other and the faculty. One Program Manager diverted funds from hiring classroom aides to paying a bilingual community liaison who, she hoped, would be able to attract parent volunteers to the school once the language barrier had been broken.

Parents are often involved in substantive decisionmaking. One school formed parent committees to draft the separate educational components of the A-127. Respondents pointed out that decisions affecting individual schools are now made by school advisory committees composed of school staff, parents and community members, and, sometimes, administrators. Decisionmaking was

described as a "shared process". A Curriculum Specialist in a suburban district with one ECE school told us,

> The School Advisory Committee makes all decisions in this district. The S.A.C. is a cross-section of the community, grade-level teachers, and one or two administrators. There are no unilateral decisions made.

Under ECE, responsibility for planning is given to individual school sites. The center of authority has tended to move from the district office to the schools. A district office evaluator remarked:

> Local schools conducting and reporting their own evaluations is very good. It gives them a sense of responsibility. Before, their attitude was, 'You get us the money and we'll spend it.' Now the schools see that they have to think carefully about how they'll plan a program and evaluate its results.

We found concrete evidence of the shift of responsibility from administrators to those who work more closely with the day-to-day implementation of the programs. When we sought information from district level respondents about specific changes in program planning or evaluation procedures, they often referred us to school level people for information, with such comments as, "See Mrs. _____, a parent, who wrote that component," or "Mrs. _____, the resource teacher, knows best about that." In some schools, principals were designated as "Program Directors". In other schools, principals delegated considerable responsibility for program planning and document writing (as well as program implementation) to teachers and school advisory committees.

Although most people interviewed were supportive of the shift of decision-making closer to those affected by the programs, problems were cited. Some district personnel felt that the school level people were too busy to handle the extra work, and were too inexperienced to suddenly assume such increased responsibility. One district office evaluator remarked:

> The building principals and program coordinators have no experience, but the State Department dumped all this stuff in their laps.

A teaching vice-principal, designated Program Director for her school lamented:

> We don't even have a Xerox here at the school. To get the stuff duplicated so the teachers and parents can all read each other's stuff, and then send the final report to the state, somebody has to run all over town just to get copies made.

While school-site personnel are busy trying to fulfill their new responsibilities, district office people who formerly had been involved in the writing of applications and plans for special funding often feel "left out". A district evaluator commented on the irony that even though he had no part in the planning process, he would probably be expected to do the year-end evaluation of the program.

> I thought (the most useful evaluation procedures were the) informal evaluation as we went along, the planning meetings, just having free communication (among staff) ... Communication had never occurred before. To me, those were the most valuable things that happened. ... (Working on the A-127) and continuing working on those school level activities and the evaluation of those things and the informal discussions and communication that happened were the most valuable things by far.

Thus, in broadening the base of participation in educational activities and shifting the responsibility for decisionmaking from the central office closer to the program at the school, the cooperative planning process required by the A-127 resulted in increased communication among a variety of participants in the educational process.

Effect on Awareness

The requirement to submit an educational plan drew attention to choices which parents and teachers could make in curriculum and instructional practices, in management procedures, evaluation activities, and budgeting. Before they decided what to include in their curricula, teachers reported examining several possible choices. To state activities that would meet objectives outlined in the A-127, teachers and parents discussed possible ramifications of their

choices. To decide how to evaluate achievement of objectives, teachers and parents examined several different standardized tests. Some developed evaluation instruments, especially in "Parent Participation" and "Staff Development" components. Thus, in the process of planning an educational program, the people given new responsibility have become more aware and sophisticated about a spectrum of educational problems. An external consultant in charge of evaluation for an agricultural district reported that the effect of the planning process:

> came in developing an awareness of a broader scope of the programs. And I think it was extremely healthy to have parents and teachers involved in the interpretation of the needs assessment data ... that they understood, and I think they understand a little more about the way the whole system works and what they're doing with kids because of that.

In attempting to execute their planning responsibilities to the best of their abilities, many teachers and parents apparently engaged in self-education. To learn about successful practices and methods used in other schools and districts, teachers attended district, county, and state conferences and workshops. Teachers visited each other's classrooms and shared ideas. The requirement to plan cooperatively opened the "closed-door" classroom style, and increased communication about and awareness of educational problems.

In the words of one assistant superintendent:

> The most useful evaluation procedure is internal self-evaluation that is not reflected in standardized test scores or criterion testing, or anything of this nature; just the ability of teachers to upgrade their own program, done through regular staff meetings, open communication among teachers, discussing strengths and weaknesses relating to their own instructional styles. Our program staff meets nearly weekly.

Thus, to school staff, process evaluation, or ongoing attention to what is happening in the educational program, is almost always considered to be the most useful kind of evaluation.

Summary of Effects of A-127

The process of gathering preliminary information and deciding what to include in the school's educational plan necessitated increased communication and cooperative effort among people who formerly had not had such responsibility. "Behind-the-scenes" activities and the content of the A-127 report have considerable effects on the school's instructional practices, management procedures, participation pattern, and awareness of educational problems and their alternative solutions. Respondents reported that the planning activities they engaged in affected all the areas mentioned for the duration of the school year. However, the A-127 submitted to the state is not only the culmination of a process at the local level; it is a written document which receives a quality rating from the department. As such, confusion exists at the local level as to the dual purpose of the A-127.

This process/product duality often causes problems because local respondents feel that their plan is the result of their best efforts and should not be included in the ranking formula. One district's evaluation consultant described this duality aptly when he said:

> The process of evaluation was good for increasing awareness of the broad scope of the programs. The products or forms are bad because of the time they require to fill out, and the misdirection of effort they encourage in terms of the school's attempting to appear successful.

Planning, then, as required by the A-127, can legitimately be called "evaluation". It is purposive; people meet to discuss goals for the future. It is also systematic; people organize the future according to specific values, goals, and activities. And it is retrospective; planners consider past performance and current needs before projecting the future. The entire process draws attention to needs; it forces values to the surface; it demands articulation of goals and targets. Thus, in the case of the A-127, it is the indirect,

long-term effects of the process on the participation patterns and on awareness that seem most important.

E-127P Procedure

Effect on Instructional Practices

Schools are required to submit the end-of-the-year E-127P to the Office of Program Evaluation and Research at the department. This document enables the schools to satisfy two legal requirements: 1) accounting for their use of funds, and 2) submitting evaluations required by certain specially funded programs. The document is almost universally regarded, by both school and district level respondents, as intended solely for use by the department in presenting information to the state Legislature; local respondents maintained that the document is not useful to them, particularly not at the school site. It was generally agreed that because it is to be submitted after the plan for the following year is submitted, it is of no use in planning next year's program. Several respondents maintained that the information contained in it is not helpful in implementation or evaluation. One district evaluator commented that:

> The E-127P has no effect because it is too dry and quantitative to be useful to nonprofessionals.

Effect on Management Procedures

In some district offices, however, information contained in the E-127P was used to reassess the appropriateness of goals set in the A-127, and to learn to improve writing of objectives. A district evaluator said that the E-127P:

> was useful in terms of the schools being able to assess whether or not they had met their objectives and then to revise objectives if they had to. ... They got better at objective writing.

In other district offices, the E-127's were used by district personnel to pinpoint certain populations whose needs were not being met. Once this

was done, district resources were allocated differently for the following year. Thus, the E-127 has limited value for district management.

Completion of the E-127P increased knowledge about evaluation data-collection techniques. As a district curriculum coordinator pointed out:

> Emphasis changed from terminal reporting to diagnosis. Thus, more testing was done in all grades. Also, teachers showed increased awareness of and sophistication in the area of evaluation, seeking new procedures and materials.

Effect on Participation

In addition to affecting management procedures, gathering information required by the E-127P has increased participation in decisionmaking about testing. A superintendent indicated that greater involvement with test selection made the teachers feel more involved in the whole testing process, even though the results had to be submitted to the department.

> It (testing) has forced us to really look into tests and come up with this other test which our teachers were quite involved in choosing, so now they are familiar with it, and it's not just something to test for administrative purposes as it used to be.

This new awareness of the uses of and differences among tests has resulted in some districts changing their testing practices. Some districts which had previously not collected such data were surprised when they began pre- and post-testing matched groups as required by E-127P. When one ECE school conducted its first pre-test, it found that students "hit the ceiling in the fall" (a majority of students scored in the 90th percentile or above). Because the test which had been used previously as a "post-test only" was not normed sufficiently high for the student population, the school changed to a more appropriate test which enabled them to see if growth had occurred between pre- and post-testing. Several districts instituted workshops to train their teachers in test-administration techniques.

Effects on Awareness

Because portions of the E-127 document were often prepared at the school site (as in the case on the A-127) by teachers, parents, and community members for submission to the department, people who formerly had no contact with the state or federal educational bureaucracies became more aware of them. This increased their awareness of the politics of education at the state and federal levels. Teachers and parents reportedly became more aware of the need to account to the state Legislature and federal government for use of funds for special programs. That the E-127P is seen as contract compliance is evident in the comment, "I have to do this dumb thing (the E-127P) to get the money." Respondents involved with ECE, a competitive, rather than an entitlement program, were very conscious of the possible influence of evaluation findings on the state Legislature's level of program funding.

Thus, all respondents acknowledged and accepted the role of evaluation in satisfying state and federal authorities. Moreover, local respondents were generally aware of and sympathetic to the political requirements faced by the department. A suburban district evaluator commented,

> I basically have faith in Sacramento ... they're interested in getting something done in education ... (but) they've got their hands tied with what the Legislature does.

Even though local respondents knew the legal and political reasons for having to submit the E-127P, many still expressed considerable annoyance at the particular document. Comments as, "The E-127P is of no use to anyone but the department," and "It is for the department. It has absolutely no internal program use," reflect a principal's and an ECE program director's views.

Summary of Effects of E-127P

Although the E-127P document was generally regarded as not being useful to local educators, respondents identified several effects attributable to

the process of gathering data required by the E-127P. These include greater awareness of educational bureaucracies and the politics which surrounds them; the role of evaluation in contract compliance; and greater sophistication in evaluation instrumentation and test-administration practices.

In general, local respondents' attitude toward the E-127P document was one of annoyance, often rising to the level of hostility. Many respondents complained about the time when it is due (out of phase with the A-127), its length, the nature of the information rquired, and the need for every funded school to submit one each year. A few respondents objected to having to report standardized test scores. They would prefer to report results on locally-developed criterion-referenced tests (although they realize that the department would be hard-pressed to aggregate such idiosyncratic data in a report to the Legislature).

The overriding feeling at the local level is that no one at the schools --and very few people in the district office--is interested in or reads, the E-127P's. In the words of one district evaluator,

> The E-127 is not going to tell the teachers how they have to write the program for the following year for two reasons: 1) it's not set up to feed you that kind of information, and 2) it actually occurs after you've written the program again ... That thing that you do for the state, you write it and don't use it for anything. It's over and dead and gone by the time you've built something for next year, which is unfortunate, because it could possibly be a tool to help you. Last year we ran off an equal number of copies of the (A-127) program and the (E-127) evaluation. We have almost no programs left, and I have a raft of evaluations. We just don't use them.

Field Visit (MAR)

All of the participating districts received on-site reviews by state department teams. In 1974-75, state ECE consultants visited each expansion ECE school plus those schools in districts which scored in the bottom quintile in statewide ranking of ECE schools; such visits were commonly referred to as MAR visits (Monitor and Review). Other departmental teams focused on

schools funded by Chapter 6.10 for educationally disadvantaged students. In the following section we will deal with MAR visits to ECE schools only. The MAR visit resulted in the completion of two forms by department consultants at the school site on the day of the visits: 1) the PR-127 form which is used to assess compliance with federal and state laws and regulations, and 2) the school program quality review instrument which was used to assess the quality of the total program on a 0-9 point scale. The use of these forms served three purposes:

> 1) it provides data for the expansion-refunding formula for ECE schools; 2) it enables schools to satisfy the contract compliance requirement for various state and federal programs; and 3) it provides external feedback to schools regarding the quality of program design and implementation.

Effect on Instructional Practices

When asked whether anything in the program had changed as a result of the MAR visit, informants reported considerable change in many areas. Most respondents said that schools had done their best to implement the MAR team's suggestions immediately. A few added that they tried to implement suggestions even if they did not agree with them. Different schools reported needing improvement in different areas. The majority of changes stimulated by the MAR visits were in the areas of curriculum, parent participation, and individualization of instruction. As a result of the MAR team's suggestions, one school developed formal curriculum "continuums" in math and langauge arts for grades K-3; another school changed to using fewer paper and pencil exercises and more math manipulatives; others instituted psychomotor skill development programs; and some strengthened weak multicultural activities. A few districts embarked upon active parent recruitment programs to increase the adult-student ratio in the classroom and improve individualization of instruction. Some schools reported shifting emphasis to areas on which they received low ratings. In all, the recommendations of the MAR auditors were taken quite seriously.

Effect on Management Procedures

Knowledge that the MAR team would rate them on their performance of recordkeeping duties led to change in many schools' recordkeeping practices. Several respondents reported keeping considerably more process information than ever before in preparation for the MAR audit. One district evaluator reported:

> This is the first year that we collected process evaluation data and that's only because the ECE MAR team has been out. The idea of an on-site audit does wonders to get the districts moving in the right direction.

Another respondent attributed improved school management procedures to MAR requirements to keep process information, "I think the whole management system of the project has improved."

Knowledge that they would be rated on accomplishments in all the educational components set forth in the ECE guidelines (and written into their A-127) kept attention distributed among the components. A few respondents indicated that without the certainty that the MAR team would rate them on all components, they might let Health/Auxiliary Services or Parent Education "slide". However, in one school, a Program Director reported that her staff and community were just not going to devote any more attention to the Language Development component, although it had not received a high rating. She asserted,

> Our school is no longer striving for a nine on the MAR evaluation. We want to concentrate on internally useful evaluation, rather than criteria set by the state. Our staff and community is satisfied with the children's reading performance, even though we didn't receive a nine, so now we'll concentrate on other components. In a conflict between having to please state or our own community, the school opted for pleasing the community.

It is interesting that although her comments indicate that in one component she will deviate from the ideal goal set by ECE guidelines, she still

plans to keep well within the overall educational plan by strengthening her school's Parent Involvement component.

Effect on Participation Patterns

Preparation for MAR visits by ECE schools affected various individuals and the school program. Several respondents reported that before the visit, their school communities mobilized themselves to an unusual degree. A respondent from a rural area commented:

> The MAR visit got the parents excited about their school because somebody was coming from Sacramento to see it. They (the teachers) organized a "MAR" visit by the county people the second year when they didn't have a regular MAR.

The esprit de corps generated by preparation for the audit reportedly lasted well beyond the day of the MAR visit, and was an essential factor in implementation of the MAR consultants' recommendations. Frequently, suggestions made by MAR teams involved revising the curriculum to include "continuums" or recruiting parent volunteers, which required team effort. Thus, an indirect effect of the MAR visit was improved school climate and increased teamwork. A few school-level respondents reported that improved school climate (teachers working together and parent participation) affected students, causing them to feel that "it was our school, now" rather than "a place we had to go."

A further MAR effect was the involvement of many teachers and parents in their own educational audits. Aspects of the MAR process were so well liked that several districts reported organizing their own internal "MAR" teams which exchanged preparatory visits within and across districts. A district level evaluator reported,

> We have an evaluation team in each of our schools which is made up of parents and staff and they go through and monitor throughout the year what's going on in terms of our programs ... Some sort of internal audit is needed that tells them what is going on continuously.

Effects on Awareness

Face-to-face contact between local people and department consultants during the MAR visits increased awareness of the workings of the department and the politics of education and evaluation at the state level. Being evaluated and receiving immediate feedback forced comparison of the local school staff's priorities to those of the ECE consultants.

Anxiety and ambivalence about the personal contact and the rating which resulted from the MAR audit was mentioned by nearly every person involved in a MAR. The following words spoken by a Program Manager clearly indicate respect for the evalution procedure, but acknowledge the anxiety which which accompanies it:

> I just don't mind being evaluated. I hate it. I hate every minute of it, but I love it while I'm at it. I don't know how to put this, but I like the cleanness of it. I like knowing what they expect of me. I like trying to reach those objectives. I like trying to make my own fit into their pattern. I think it's clean.

Some districts which received ratings lower than they had anticipated (or were denied expansion funding) expressed hostility toward the department. They felt betrayed by the MAR consultants, who, they had believed, were coming to the school to "help" them.

Even though the MAR entailed ranking and generated anxiety, most school-level respondents reported that they enjoyed the opportunity for face-to-face contact with department representatives. Teachers and parents reportedly were pleased that the department "cared" about their school, and knew first hand, via the visiting consultants, what was happening to the program. In nearly every case, members of the MAR teams were remembered by name and praised highly. Only a few local respondents complained of uncommunicative or rigid MAR evaluators.

Summary of Effects of MAR

Although anxiety accompanied the MAR visit, and staff and parents were sometimes disappointed by the rating they received after they had "worked so hard", the MAR visit was perceived to be the most beneficial required evaluation procedure. The MAR visit generally was viewed as invaluable technical assistance provided to local schools. Because schools wanted to receive a higher rating the following year, efforts were usually made to implement recommendations post haste.

For these reasons, the MAR visit affected educational programs at school sites, how programs were evaluated internally, and local staff perceptions of and attitudes toward the department.

IV. ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROCEDURAL CHANGES

Analysis

The three state evaluative procedures examined in this report result in different impacts on local educational program. The A-127 planning procedures and the MAR site visits have had considerable impact on participation patterns in local school decisionmaking, and have increased awareness of educational problems and practices among school staffs and active parents. These two procedures also influenced instruction and management in local schools.*

In contrast, the E-127 report, which provides most of the evaluative information submitted to the Legislature and other state "control" agencies, has had little direct impact on local educational programs.

These differences in impact result from the following factors:

1. Completion of the A-127 planning procedure and the MAR reviews require new and broader patterns of participation in local schools.

---

*Because the initial study design anticipated most evaluative impact to occur at district central offices, our conclusions are based upon the perceptions of central office personnel and a smaller number of school site personnel.

2. Both the A-127 and the MAR focus the attention of school staffs and active parents upon educational means and ends. Both procedures represent departures from past school practice because the first requires the preparation of a written planning document and the second involves personal encounters between local and state educational staff coupled with ratings of each school's progress toward implementing its A-127 plan.

3. Both the A-127 and MAR procedures are completed during the school year and involve the consideration by a broad based group of staff and parents of immediate steps that may be undertaken to improve the instructional program.

4. The successful completion of the A-127 and MAR procedures is tied to the future allocation of money to each school district.

The E-127 procedure shares this latter characteristic. However, it fails to incorporate the timeliness of the A-127 and the MAR. Neither does it stimulate new patterns of participation in local decisio making. Further, the E-127 requires statistical information that many local educators and parents find difficult to understand. While completion of the E-127 is accepted as a requirement for further state funding, it is not greeted with enthusiasm because it is perceived as far less helpful to local schools than the A-127 or the MAR. This pattern of inpact of the various state evaluative procedures appears to hold true in spite of the variations in size of urban-rural character of the districts considered in this study.

Thus, the major factor influencing local impact of evaluative procedures appears not to be the character of local districts but rather the character and vigor of the state evaluative intervention, which have been significantly

altered since 1972 with consolidated application procedures and the implementation of ECE.

All three evaluative procedures impose more work on local districts. Because of the extra work and because each procedure requires a rating to be given to local efforts by the department, each procedure is viewed with a measure of resentment and anxiety by local educators. These reactions have been accentuated by changes in the nature of the A-127 and E-127 during the first years of implementation. However, in the case of the A-127 and the MAR, these unpleasant aspects, as viewed by local school staff, are substantially less important than the positive contributions made by the procedures to the conduct of local educational programs.

Recommendations for Procedural Changes

It appears that state-local relations could be enhanced through improvements in State Department of Education internal operations. Improved communication and coordination within the State Department of Education, particularly between the Program Branch and OPER, would be a major step toward accomplishing these goals. Until this is accomplished only marginal improvement can take place.

Progress has been made in orienting educational planning to the total educational program of a school, rather than fragmented funding sources. Considerable progress is also evident in including information other than cognitive achievement gain scores in summative reports to the Legislature. We urge that progress in these directions be continued. We question, however, whether each school must submit information contained in the present E-127P each year. A sampling method, coupled with in-depth analyses of certain districts (which is already underway), might provide more manageable information. If fewer districts and schools were required to submit a reduced E-127P, the problem of a year-end submittal date might not be so acute.

We also recommend that the State Department of Education set long-term (perhaps five years) policy concerning the precise nature of evaluative information required from the local level. Once agreement is reached on necessary information, the State Department of Education should establish procedures for acquiring this information with the least amount of state and local effort.

In this context, it would be desirable to place greater evaluation responsibility with local school personnel. The State Department of Education might consider expanding its evaluation improvement projects and provide training to county, district, school site personnel, and community members.

- Establishment and implementation of a long-range policy for acquiring evaluative information from local schools and districts ought to be accompanied by clear communication of requirements to local educators. The State Department of Education needs to clarify its rationale for data and the schedule for submission. This would alleviate problems of frequently changing forms and requirements that are often unaccompanied by clear instructions.

Considerable progress has been made in reducing the number of forms and documents that must be submitted to the State Department of Education annually. For example, schools receiving successful ratings are not required only to amend the A-127 planning document to reflect program changes, rather than having to submit an entire plan each year. In addition, while the MAR and field visit audits have been generally acclaimed in this report for providing face-to-face contact, resulting in useful feedback, we are pleased to note that successful schools are not required to be visited each year. This policy appears to allow the State Department of Education to focus its efforts on assisting beginning ECE schools, as well as those with less successful programs.

V. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The findings of this study indicate that the state-mandated evaluation procedures examined in this report are having considerable effect on local school district programs and procedures.

In order for the State Department of Education to maximize the kinds of local level impact described in this report, we recommend further efforts and investigations in three major areas.

Impact of State-mandated Planning, Monitor and Review and Evaluation Procedures

Our study revealed that state-mandated planning procedures and monitor and review site visitations had a demonstrable effect in focusing school site planning on the total educational program of the school, rather than on individual funding sources. In addition, the quality and immediacy of feedback on program quality, the emergence of a school planning group composed of school staff and parents, and the increasing awareness of school staff and parents about program design, implementation and evaluation, all combined to affect school instructional programs.

In light of these findings, we recommend that the State Department of Education further examine the impact of the school level planning process and the MAR site visitations on local schools. Such examinations should focus particularly on ways to refine these successful processes for potential incorporation in future State Department of Education reform efforts.

Further Examination of the Most Effective "Mix" of Evaluative Data

In the context of establishing long-term evaluation policy, the State Department of Education should continually assess the effectiveness and utility of the various types of evaluative data currently in use or contemplated for future use by "consumers" of State Department of Education evaluation data

and reports including state policymakers, local policymakers, school personnel, and parents and other members of local communities.

School personnel often find "process assessment" strategies such as the A-127 plan rating and MAR rating more useful and more illustrative of program improvement than the results of standardized cognitive achievement tests. However, this finding may also indicate an inadequate understanding of the uses of achievement data on the part of school personnel, parents, and local school policymakers.

On the other hand, recent state policy debates over the accomplishments of the ECE effort have tended to focus primarily on standardized test results. This may indicate that state policymakers perceive this kind of information to be more useful, but it may also suggest that state decisionmakers do not adequately understand the nature or impact of the "process assessment" data that the schools tend to perceive as more useful.

It appears that both process and achievement data are and will continue to be useful and necessary. In further developing and refining the "mix" of required evaluation information, we recommend that the State Department of Education carefully assess the needs of the various consumers of evaluative information and attempt to balance evaluation resources and requirements accordingly. In addition, we recommend that the State Department of Education continue its efforts to clearly articulate the uses and findings of different types of evaluative data to the various consumers of the information.

Further Exploration of the Impact of Reform Incentive Funding Strategies

Finally, we suggest that the ECE method of granting funds on a competitive, incentive basis be further examined and refined. We found that this strategy helps insure that districts seeking funds will comply with requirements set by the State Department of Education. However, a point of diminishing

returns may be reached in districts whose educational policy is incompatible with ECE program goals. Districts may also refuse to participate in ECE if state funds are not perceived to be worth the local time to complete ECE paperwork.

We recommend that the State Department of Education attempt to examine the effects of incentive funding strategies in greater depth so that other proposed reform efforts (i.e., Reform of Intermediate and Secondary Education) may benefit from the State Department of Education's experience with ECE. In light of potential difficulties with "diminishing returns" as reform efforts expand toward participation of all schools, we also recommend that the State Department of Education explore alternative methods to renovate or rejuvenate incentives in order to maintain the momentum for reform.

APPENDIX A
(1 and 2)

Appendix A-1 is the cover letter which introduced our study and requested participation of the districts which we had selected. It was sent with the Mailed Evaluation Questionnaire (Appendix A-2), which was intended to gather background on evaluation activities in the district before the personal interviews were conducted.

These items were mailed to respondents in April and May 1975.

APPENDIX A-1

Evaluation Consortium

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Stanford University, Stanford, California, 94305

Dear _____:

The Stanford University Evaluation Consortium and the San Mateo Center of the Evaluation Improvement Project are working together on a research project to explore the impact ov evaluation on educational programs. Four programs are being considered: Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Title I), Education for Disadvantaged Youth (EDY), Early Childhood Education (ECE), and state bilingual (2284).

The purpose of the study is to gather information at the school, district, and state level and to make recommendations to the State Department of Education for the improvement of evaluation requirements and procedures. It is not a study of particular LEAs. The confidentiality of participating LEAs will be maintained.

We are writing to request your participation in the study. Your district has been randomly selected as one of fifteen for inclusion in our district level sample. We would like your cooperation in three ways:

(1) We would like to interview you, at your convenience, during the first three weeks of May.

(2) The team member interviewing you would like to look through the district E-127 from last year and, any other written evaluation documentation you might have gathered for internal use on the above-mentioned four programs within your district.

(3) We would like you to complete and return the enclosed questionnaire by April 25. The factual information from the questionnaire will provide the basis for the interview. Upon receipt of your completed evaluation questionnaire, we will phone you to arrange a convenient meeting time.

We are aware of the severe time constraints upon all district personnel, particularly at the end of the school year. We will make every effort to take as little of your time as possible for this study, which, we hope will benefit LEAs future evaluation efforts.

Many thanks for your cooperation in our research project.

Nelson Price
Director, Northern Development Center
Evaluation Improvement Project
San Mateo County Office of Education

Steve Weiner
Associate Director
Evaluation Consortium
Stanford University

SH/cs
cc: [redacted], Superintendent

APPENDIX A-2

Mailed Evaluation Questionnaire

To the respondent:

Please note that information requested refers to the school year 1973-1974.

The programs under study are the Early Childhood Education (ECE) program, the Education for Disadvantaged Yourth (EDY) program, Title I of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, (Title I), and the state bilingual program (AB 2284).

Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to: Evaluation Consortium, School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305, by April 25, 1975. If necessary, please use the back of the sheets.

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Your name: _____

2. Your district: _____

3. Your title or position: _____

4. Please describe your major responsibilities:

_____

_____

_____

5. Please give information on funding of the following programs during 1973-1974:

Program	Amount of federal or state categorical aid actually spent on program.	Amount of federal or state categorical aid actually spent on evaluation of program.	District funds (if any) spent on evaluation of programs	
			Amount	% of district budget
ECE				
EDY				
Title I				
Bilingual 2284				

II. INFORMATION ON PROGRAM ACTIVITIES OF 1973-1974

6. Please give the name and position of district staff members who were responsible for administering the programs in 1973-74. (Check ✓ program(s) associated with each staff person):

Name	Position	Programs			
		ECE	EDY	Title I	2284

7. Please give the name and position of school staff members who were responsible for administering the programs in their schools for 1973-74. (Check ✓ program(s) associated with each staff person):

Name	Position	School	Programs			
			ECE	EDY	Title I	2284

8. Please give the names of the chairpersons of the 1973-1974 District Advisory Council(s) for each program (Check program associated with each person):

Name of Chairperson	Programs			
	ECE	EDY	Title I	2284

III. INFORMATION ON EVALUATION ACTIVITIES OF 1973-1974

9. Please give the name and position of district staff who were in charge of evaluation of the programs in 1973-74. (Check ✓ program(s) associated with each staff person):

Name	Position	Programs			
		ECE	EDY	Title I	Bilingual

10. Please identify members of the district staff who were assigned to evaluation activities:

Name	Position	Education Degree Attained	Temp. or Perm. staff	% time spent on evaluation	Programs				Schools in which worked
					ECE	EDY	Title I	2284	

11. Please identify members of school staffs who were responsible for evaluation of the programs within your district in 1973-74. (Check ✓ program(s) associated with each staff member):

Name	Position	School	Evaluation Responsibilities	Programs			
				ECE	EDY	Title I	228

12. Were external evaluation consultants employed to assist in any phase of the program evaluations in 1973-74? _____yes _____no

If yes, please identify the consultant as follows. Fill in under "Programs" the school in which the consultant worked on those programs in 1973-74.

Name	Firm	Evaluation Activities	When (Dates)	Program/Schools			
				ECE	EDY	Title I	2284

13. Did any school in the district receive a visit during 1973-74 from a Regional Service team, a Monitor and Review team, or a Program Review and Improvement team? _____yes _____no

If yes, fill in the following information (check program and type of team):

School	Date of visit	Program Reviewed				Type of Team			Name of team leader
		ECE	EDY	Title I	2284	RST	MAR	PRI	

14. Did any district or school staff receive any training or technical assistance in evaluation procedures during 1973-1974 for these programs? _____yes _____no

If yes, please identify source of T/TA (state or local trainers) and phase of evaluation activities in which T/TA occurred (check program).

Name of staff receiving T/TA	Nature of T/TA relating to evaluation procedure	Agency or person providing T/TA (state or local)	Program			
			ECE	EDY	Title I	2284

15. Please give the following information on the different phases of program evaluation. (Check program(s) associated with each activity.):

Evaluation Activity (specify as necessary)	Program				When activity occurred	Estimated total amt. of time devoted to activity (hrs. or days)	Who responsible?
	ECE	EDY	Title I	2284			
Design of evaluation:							
Testing:							
Collection of data other than tests (Observations, interviews, etc.):							
Data analysis:							

15. continued

Evaluation Activity (specify as necessary)	Program				When activity occurred	Estimated total amt. of time devoted to activity (hrs. or days)	Who responsible?
	ECE	EDY	Title I	2284			
Write-up of E-127:							
Write-up of other reports:							
Other activities -- please specify:							

16. Were any evaluation activities undertaken in any program which were for internal use only and were not required by state or federal evaluation guidelines? ____ yes ____ no

If yes, please supply the following information:

Program Involved				Type of evaluation activity	Total amount of time spent on activity	When undertaken	Who responsible?
ECE	EDY	Title I	2284				

17. Were any final evaluation reports prepared other than the E127?
____yes ____no

If yes, please supply the following information:

Program Involved				Type of report	Total amount of time spent on report	When written	Who responsible?
ECE	EDY	Title I	2284				

18. Who received copies or read the final evaluation reports?

Name of report (E127 or other as in question #17)	Recipients of report(s) (Please check ✔)					
	school board	community groups	parents	teachers	school staff	other (specify)

19. Were any instruments developed specifically for evaluation of these programs in your district? _____ yes _____ no

If yes, please supply the following information:

Program involved				Name or nature of instrument	By whom developed
ECE	ED/	Title I	2284		

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE - LOCAL LEVEL

Appendix B is the interview format which all three researchers used when they interviewed people responsible for conducting required evaluations. The same interview guide was used for people at the district office and people whose base of operations was the school site.

Although there were inevitably variations among interviews due to the nature of the interview process, and the fact that three researchers conducted 31 interviews with people of differing responsibilities, each category on the questionnaire format was covered.

Interviews were taped, and analyses made of the content of the tapes. Tabulations of the responses were disregarded as not being useful because the instrument was weak and ambiguous, and because the most interesting information was revealed in the explanations and qualifications of the one-word responses. (See Section 1 for greater detail.)

INTRODUCTION TO DISTRICT INTERVIEW

I'm a member of the research team studying the use of program evaluation with Dr. Weiner (of Stanford) and Dr. Price(of the San Matteo Evaluation Improvement Project).

We are not investigating particular districts, but are trying to find out what districts do generally in the area of program evaluation in order to make recommendations to the State for improvement of evaluation procedures and processes.

The information received during the interview is confidential, although, we would like to be able to quote you in the final report when and where appropriate. Anything you indicate is off-the-record would of course not be used. In order to have more reliable information, I would like to tape the interview. Do you mind if I record the conversation with you?

The information we want is about program evaluation of the (I, EDY, ECE, bil) programs. The answers to questions I ask may differ for the (4, 3, or 2) programs. When your answer differs from program to program, or applies only to 1 program, please tell me. The questions, unless we indicate otherwise, apply only to this school year. (NB report section refers to last year.)

We hope to follow-up district level interviews with interviews in a few schools from our nine county sample. At this point in time we are identifying schools appropriate for follow-up. Of the schools in your district with (I,EDY, ECE, bil) programs, are there any that have conducted particularly successful evaluations? Are there any that have had difficulty in conducting an evaluation? Would you mind if we talked with the director of the ( ) program in these schools at a later time?

The interview has 6 parts. The first part concerns the purpose of program evaluation.

I. PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

1. In your opinion, what are the real reasons the State requires program evaluation?

reasons \ program	I	EDY	ECE	bil.
a. contract compliance				
b. procurement of funds from leg.				
c. satisfaction of fed. req.				
d. local program improvement				
e. don't know				
f. other				

2. Do the reasons vary from program to program? _____yes _____no

   if yes, how?

3. If there were no state requirements for program evaluation, what information would you recommend your district collect for its own purposes?

information \ program	I	EDY	ECE	bil.
a. student achievement				
b. student attitudes				
c. student behavior				
d. parent satisfaction				
e. teacher satisfaction				
f. auxiliary services				
g. program management				
h. none				
i. other				

4. Would these recommendations be different for any of the programs? _____ yes _____ no

If yes, In what way?

5. For what purposes should the district collect this information?

purposes \ program	I	EDY	ECE	bil.
a. program monitoring				
b. program development				
c. program improvement				
d. information to parents				
e. feedback to teachers				
f. research				
g. other				

II. COMMUNICATION CHANNELS: I'd like to know something about the ways in which your district communicates with the State Department of Education.

1. First, how do you exchange information? Please distinguish by program as necessary.

	program / communication	I	EDY	ECE	bil.
a.	telephone				
b.	individualized letters, memos				
c.	standardized correspondence				
d.	personal contacts				
e.	T/TA				
f.	conferences				
g.	other				

2. How frequently do you communicate?

	program / frequency	I	EDY	ECE	bil.
a.	once/week				
b.	once/month				
c.	3 time/year				
d.	once/year				
e.	never				

3. How useful would you say this communication is?

	program / usefulness	I	EDY	ECE	bil.
a.	very				
b.	moderately				
c.	somewhat				
d.	not useful				
e.	hindrance				
f.	other				

4. How would you characterize your relationship with the SDE?

	program / relationship	I	EDY	ECE	bil.
a.	very warm				
b.	cordial only				
c.	lukewarm				
d.	businesslike				
e.	hostile				
f.	other				

5. I'd like to know something about communication WITHIN THE DISTRICT between program staff and evaluation staff (or external consultants). How is information exchanged? Please distinguish by program as necessary.

	communications / program	I	EDY	ECE	bil.
a.	phone				
b.	individualized letters				
c.	regular meetings				
d.	irregular meetings				
e.	formal, widely distr. correspondence				
f.	conferences, workshops				
g.	other				

6. How often do the staffs communicate?

	frequency / program	I	EDY	ECE	bil.
a.	every day				
b.	once a week				
c.	once a month				
d.	less than once/month				

7. In a few words, how would you characterize the relationship between evaluation and program staff?

	relationship \ program	I	EDY	ECE	Bil.
a.	very warm				
b.	cordial only				
c.	lukewarm				
d.	businesslike				
e.	hostile				
f.	varies by school				
g.	other				

8. I'd like to know also about communication WITHIN THE DISTRICT between district and school staffs on evaluation matters. How is information exchanged?

	information \ program	I	EDY	ECE	Bil.
a.	phone				
b.	individualized letters				
c.	regular meetings				
d.	irregular meetings				
e.	formal/widely distr. corresp.				
f.	conferences, workshops				
g.	other				

9. Do the staffs communicate frequently?

	frequency \ program	I	EDY	ECE	Bil.
a.	every day				
b.	once a week				
c.	once a month				
d.	less than once/month				
f.	other				

Communications channels page 4

10. How would you characterize their relationships?

	program / relationship	I	EDY	ECE	Bil.
a.	very warm				
b.	cordial only				
c.	lukewarm				
d.	businesslike				
e.	hostile				
f.	varies by school				
g.	other				

11. I'd like to know something about communication between the district and the COMMUNITY. How is information exchanged?

	program / information	I	EDY	ECE	Bil.
a.	telephone conversations				
b.	personal contacts				
c.	correspondence/newsletters				
d.	conferences, workshops				
e.	advisory council meetings				
f.	PTA				
g.	other				

12. How frequently do you communicate?

	program / frequency	I	EDY	ECE	Bil.
a.	every day				
b.	once a week				
c.	once a month				
d.	less than once/month				

Communications channels page 5

13. How would you characterize your relationship?

relationship \ program	I	EDY	ECE	Bil.
a. very warm				
b. cordial only				
c. lukewarm				
d. businesslike				
e. hostile				
f. varies by school				
g. other				

III. EVALUATION REPORT

1. Did any of the individuals or groups that read a copy of the E-127 request it?

yes _____ no _____

board members _____

all program staff _____

all administrative staff _____

parent & community advisory panel members _____

other _____

2. Did you get any feedback from any of the above mentioned individuals or groups that received the E-127? yes _____ no _____

3. Do you think the information in the 1973-74 E-127 (or other evaluation report) had any direct or indirect effect on the way the program(s) was run this year? yes _____ no _____
How? (specify program)

4. Do you think the State is moving toward competitive ranking of schools for the purpose of program fund allocation? What is your feeling about this possible procedure? yes _____ no _____

IV. EVALUATION PROCESS

1. (From Mail Q. #12) If NO EXTERNAL consultants were used,

   a. Did you ever consider using external evaluation consultants for any particular program? yes _____ no _____

   b. If YES, for which program?
   Title I _____ EDY _____ ECE _____ Bilingual _____

   c. If YES, why did you not then use them?

   d. If NOT, why not?
   _____ own staff sufficiently trained
   _____ too little money
   _____ wouldn't know who to hire
   _____ other

2. If external consultants WERE USED,

   a. Why did you hire consultants instead of using internal staff?
   _____ own staff insufficiently trained
   _____ own staff overworked
   _____ thought external consultants would be better
   _____ was included in budget
   _____ other

   b. Were you satisfied with the job the external consultants did?
   _____ very much so
   _____ yes, but they were weak in _____ area
   _____ yes, but I'd rather have adequate internal staff
   _____ no, would never use again

3. (From Mail Q. #13 we know that the school received a PRI/MAR/RST visit.)

   a. Did your staff think the team (specify team) was well-qualified? yes ___ no ____

   b. Was their evaluation of the program fair? yes _____ no _____

   c. Do you think anything changed in the program as a result of their visit?
   Yes _____ No_____

   d. If Yes, what changed?

   _____staffing patterns
   _____student groups
   _____parent participation
   _____curriculum
   _____degree of individualization
   _____types of educational materials used
   _____other

Evaluation Process Page 2

4. Which evaluation procedures undertaken during 1973-74 did you find most/least useful?

	I		EDY		ECE		Bil.	
	L	M	L	M	L	M	L	M
a. standardized testing								
b. articulating program goals								
c. monitoring programs								
d. developing own "instruments"								
e. comparing schools								
f. staff development								
g. contact with parent/comm. groups								
h. conducting needs assessments								
i. recommending program change on basis of evaluation								

Does this vary by program?

5

a. Do you feel that the PROCESS of conducting program evaluations (testing and/or data gathering, articulating goals, etc.) had any direct or indirect effect on the way the program ran during 1973-74 or the subsequent year?

_____ yes _____ no

b. If yes, how?
Probe. Did you make any changes in:

hiring patterns
classroom management
use of parent and advisory panels
curriculum
other (specify)

V. PROGRAM CHANGE

1. What changes were made in the programs this year, that is how is it different from previous years? Please distinguish by program as necessary.

	I	EDY	ECE	Bil.
a. new curriculum				
b. staffing changes				
c. new materials				
d. administrative				
e. funding changes				
f. other				

2. Who decided to make those changes? In other words, how did the changes come about?

	I	EDY	ECE	Bil.
a. E-127 recommendations				
b. community pressure				
c. principal's decision				
d. teacher pressure				
e. parent pressure				
f. result of PRI/WAR visit				
g. Superintendent's decision				
h. other				

Program change Page 2

3. Of all possible changes that have been or could be made in the programs, which would you consider the most important?

	I	EDY	ECE	Bil.
a. hire more teachers				
b. hire more aides				
c. hire more administrators				
d. more training				
e. curriculum change				
f. change salaries				
g. bring in more kids				
h. bring in different kinds of kids				
i. different materials/resources				
j. more materials/resources				
k. structural change in program				
l. other (discuss below)				

4. Do you think there has been a change in the overall climate or feeling in the programs this year? (Probe for bilingual differences, if appropriate.)

	I	EDY	ECE	Bil.
a. more professionalism among teacher/aides				
b. more confidence of all involved in program				
c. awareness of kids' needs				
d. more knowledge of program goals				
e. better teaching				
f. other (discuss below)				

EVALUATION PROCEDURES CHANGE (Optional Section)

1. Have any evaluation procedures changed in your district in the 1973-74 school year? Please distinguish by program if necessary.

	I	EDY	ECE	Bil.
a. now use external evaluator				
b. use new tests				
c. test at different times				
d. test more children				
e. test fewer children				
f. new program objectives measured				
g. involve parents more				
h. more T/TA				
i. more money				
j. more release time for teachers				
k. other				

2. What additional changes in procedures would improve the usefulness of evaluation in your district?

	I	EDY	ECE	Bil.
a. now use external evaluator				
b. use new tests				
c. test at different times				
d. test more children				
e. test fewer children				
f. new program objectives measured				
g. involve parents more				
h. more T/TA				
i. more money				
j. more release time for teachers				
k. other				

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW GUIDE - STATE LEVEL

State Department of Education Questionnaire

I. PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

1. What does the (name of program) evaluation consist of?
2. For what purpose is the evaluation intended?
3. What use is made of the information collected on (name of program)?

II. EVALUATION IMPACT AT STATE LEVEL

A. On district (re)funding decisions

1. How were districts funded the first year of (name of program)?
2. How were districts funded last year?
   (Find out coming year if time permits.)
3. How were districts informed about the criteria used for refunding?
   (Get written documentation.)
4. Is the information collected for evaluation used in refuding decisions?
   (Get specific examples.)
5. Who makes decisions about refunding for (name of program)?

B. On SED internal operation procedures

1. How are evaluation requirements (program regulations/guidelines) changed?
2. How do program guidelines and regulations influence evaluation requirements?
   (How do evaluation requirements, influence program guidelines and regulations?)
3. How does the Program Dept. make input into the development of evaluation requirements?
   (How does the Evaluation Dept. make input into the development of program guidelines and regulations?)

4. Under what circumstances might you investigate an (name of program) in a particular district?

5. What are the most frequent criticisms (favorable comments) received from locals about (name of program) evaluation requirements?

   (Program regulations/guidelines)

C. On budget cycle (legislative)

1. What kind of information do you have to provide to the Legislature?

   (To other groups: Governor, State Board of Educ., Legislative Analyst's Office, etc.)

2. What influence do you feel evaluation has on budget decisions concerning (name of program)?

3. (If time permits, ask):

   a. Who prepares the annual report to the Legislature for (name of program)?

   b. Who presents the report to the Legislature?

   c. Where does the information in the report come from?

D. On budget cycle (within SDE)

1. Does the evaluation of (name of program) have any effect on the internal budgetary allocations within the SDE? If so, how?

2. Who decides what percentage of the (name of program) budget is used by SDE and for what purposes it is used?

III. EVALUATION IMPACT AT LOCAL LEVEL

1. Which of the information/procedures required by the SDE was intended for use by locals?

2. For what purpose was it intended they use it?

3. Do the locals use this information? For what purposes do they use it?

4. What effect does evaluation (A-127, E-127, audits, contract compliance reviews, MAR, the evaluation process) have on program development at the local level?

5. At times evaluation requirements affect programs at the local level. At other times they affect the way in which locals write about their programs. Would you comment from your perspective on the difference between the two types of impact that evaluation has?

6. What would you change in the current evaluation requirements (program regulations/guidelines) in order to facilitate the use of evaluation by locals for local program improvement?

7. What are the obstacles to doing so?

IV. CONSOLIDATED APPLICATION/EVALUATION PROCEDURES

1. What is your feeling about the consolidation evaluation?

2. How is the consolidated evaluation different from previous evaluation procedures?

3. How does the consolidation application and evaluation affect your task of preparing a separate evaluation report to the Legislature?

4. Does (name of program) exist as a separate program at the local level?

5. How do the districts (schools) feel about the move toward consolidation?

6. How do the Program staff (Evaluation staff) feel about the move toward consolidation?

7. What is the relationship between the A-127 and the E-127?

APPENDIX D - Explanation of State-mandated evaluation requirements, A127, E127, and Field Visits

I. The A127

The A127 is known as both the consolidated application and as the Plan. The former term designates the district level A127 (the A127D) in which the district applies for funding under various sources. The A127 ES is the elementary school plan in which the school site states its objectives for the use of the funding. Only the ECE program has required submission of the A127 ES to the state in the past, but all programs served by the A127 will require a school plan to be submitted to the Department in 1975-76.

The district submits a single A127 in applying for aid under any or all of the categorical funding sources included in the A127 process. For 1972-1973 school year districts first used the A127 to apply for funds under Title I and Title II of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA); the Miller-Unruh Reading program; the Special Teacher Employment Program; and the State Preschool program. In 1973-74 application for ECE; SB90 and AB2284 (Bilingual education) were also included in the A127.

The proposed allocation of funds from specific sources must be described by local districts in the section on Funding Requests. Administrative details are to be included in sections on Personnel Requirements, Participants, Budgets, Project Management Time Frame, and Management Support System. But the bulk of the form is devoted to description of the "needs assessment" results and the rationale for and nature of the multifunded project which is intended to meet those needs. The project description section includes a statement of objectives

related to the stated needs, evaluation specifications for those objectives, and specific evaluation methods for the activities. To ensure that cooperative planning has occurred, the A127 must be signed by the Chairperson of the District Advisory Council as well as by an authorized representative of the district.

To further the usefulness of the A127 as a local planning document, several pages are included which are not intended for submission to SDE: 1) a section on the proposed dissemination of the evaluation document to various school and community groups; 2) the proposed classroom organization; and 3) a plan for the coordination of community resources to aid in project implementation.

The A127 must be submitted to the SDE by May 15th with proposals for the following school year. Approval by the Department normally occurs within 60 days. Review of the proposals for entitlement programs such as ESEA, Title I, and SB90 does not necessarily involve program judgments on the part of the Department but primarily involves ascertaining if parents have been involved and if the requested funding conforms to the district's entitlement according to program formulae.

In the case of ECE, however, the Plan submitted by the school is critical in the competition for expansion funding. The Plan is rated independently by two readers using a form entitled Evaluation Criteria for Comprehensive School Level Plans and the readers produce a quantitative score. (If the scores of the two readers are more than one standard deviation apart, a third reader reads the plan and the scores are averaged.) This schore becomes part of the complex formula which yields a district ECE score which, in turn, determines whether further schools in the district can participate in ECE.

II. The E127

The E127 has taken two different basic forms: the Product Evaluation Report, or E127P, and the Program Implementation Report, or E127I. An E127P must be submitted by all schools which are receiving categorical funding through the A127 process. The E127I is required only from ECE schools, but may include discussion of activities funded by other sources if these funds are used in a total ECE program. In some districts, separate school E127P's need not be submitted (depending upon certain complicated criteria); in those cases, the district must submit a single E127P aggregating data from its schools. There is an optional E127S or District Summary report form which may be submitted by districts which are submitting E127P's on two or more schools. The E127 was first used in 1973-74 for Title I, ECE, Miller-Unruh, SB90, Indian Education (SB1258), and Bilingual Education (AB2284).

The E127P consists of sections on Funding, detailing applicable sources; on Participants, reporting counts of pupils, staff, and parents served by various program components; on Personnel Employed; on Program Description; and, on Program Implementation. Like the A127, the Program Description section constitutes the bulk of the report, giving the objectives, evaluation criteria, instruments, and results for each of the A127 components. Summary of test data must be included for the language and mathematics components, and scores for students who took both a pre- and a post-test are required. The distribution of the scores for each component on the spring post-test are also to be included by the local district. For those components which do not yield pupil test results, rating scale self-reports are requested to assess component effectiveness. The Program Implementation section requests information on the degree to which proposed activities were or were not accomplished. The E127P must be submitted to OPER by July 15.

The E127I consists of the same information requests as the Program Implementation section of the E127P with the exception that the school must also include proposals for resolving situations in which activities were not implemented according to plan. The E127I is required to be submitted by ECE schools only in December and in April.

The E127P fills several functions at the local and at the state level. Completion of the E127P enables districts to account to state and federal agencies for the use of received funds--an audit function. It also provides information on program effects to comply with legislative requirements for evaluation of the various participating programs.

Beyond the legal compliance function, the Department uses E127P information in defending continued receipt of program funds. OPER aggregates district data and prepares a summary annual report on each categorical program.[6] These annual reports are sent to the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst's office which are responsible for analyzing the report in light of the Department's budget requests. The Governor's Budget represents the outcome of this process, in which a funding level appropriate to the program's effectiveness is requested from the Legislature. Evaluation may play a further role when the Legislature itself considers the budget requests. Representative from the Department of Finance and Department of Education may be called to testify before committees to justify or elaborate upon proposed program appropriations. The Legislative Analyst prepares a report separate from and analytical of the Governor's Budget and makes extensive use of evaluation reports in that document. For example, in the Report on the 75-76 budget, the Legislative Analyst has used reports on ECE and EDY to construct a table comparing each program's effectiveness on reading and math scores.[7] Information from the E127P thus plays an important role in the entire budgetary cycle within

state government.

The information from the E127P and the E127I play important parts in internal budgetary allocations within the SDE. In allocating ECE expansion funds, the E127P provides "product" and budgetary information and the E127I "process" information which determines districts' relative standing.[8] Refunding of SB90 school sites is theoretically contingent upon positive evidence of program effectiveness, but because this is an entitlement program, SDE does not usually exercise its right to revoke a program's funding.

III. Field Visits

The third evaluative activity conducted by the SDE consists of field visits to schools and districts by members of what is now called the Field Service Unit, in the Program Branch. While this Unit provides technical assistance to districts by means of what have been called Regional Service Teams (RST), the evaluation function resides in the visits of Program Review and Improvement teams (PRI) and, for ECE, Monitor and Review (MAR) teams, which have conducted contract compliance and quality assessment reviews.

In the past, MAR teams have been charged with visiting schools receiving funds from ECE, while PRI teams visited schools receiving only non-ECE categorical funding. The reorganization of the Program Branch has provided for the amalgamation of MAR and PRI teams into the single Field Services Unit teams.

Both teams have used a rating document, the "Points of Inquiry" or PR-127, to assess both the district's and the school's compliance with program guidelines. Teams ascertain that program participants were selected according to legislative requirements, that needs assessments were indeed conducted, that baseline data and objectives are on file at the site, and so forth. The PR127 also includes a Quality Review section

applicable to the school only. For this section, the team must visit classrooms and observe the presence or absence of key program components, such as individualized instruction and multicultural emphasis. Criteria are spelled out at length in the rating form which is sent to schools in advance.

The PR127 rating given the school with ECE funding forms part of the district's expansion funding score. For the other programs, the rating constitutes the annual program audit, and sites not in compliance would be assisted in achieving compliance or face removal of their funding.

APPENDIX E - Explanation of ECE evaluation procedures and ranking formula, with timeline for completion of separate requirements

Schools are evaluated in each year of ECE operation, and the average scores of the ECE schools define the district score which in turn determines the district's eligibility to bring more schools into the program. The nature of the school scoring system has been as follows:

In the spring of 1975, a school in its first operational year was judged 100% on the basis of its ECE implementation, this score being derived 50% from its MAR rating, 25% from its A-127 rating, and 25% from its E-127I rating. (The E-127I will not be used in this formulation in 1976.) Although three E-127I's were submitted in 1974-75, only one was used in the formula for awarding 1975-76 expansion funds--that E-127I submitted in December; those submitted in April and June were too late for inclusion in the expansion formula.

For a school in its second operational year in 1974-75, the school score was determined from a formula of 70% Implementation (broken down as above), 20% budgetary information, and 10% E-127P data. The budgetary information and the E-127P scores were those from the first operational year, however, because the funding decisions once again were made before the end of the school year and thus could not utilize the test results or budgetary information obtained at the end of the year. In other words, the general pattern is that E-127P information makes a dent in the school's score a year and half later; P scores submitted in August are used by the SDE in decisions made the following March for the subsequent academic year.

The budgetary information is derived from the E-127P. The SDE is interested in learning if the district or school actually spent their allocation the way they said they would; the actual expenditures are compared against the A-127 proposals. A perfect score results when expenditures exactly match proposals. Less than perfect scores are given on the basis of the extent of deviation from the plan.

This budgetary criterion is seen as an intermediate step, not an end in itself. The SDE did not feel it would be fair to rate "young" programs on the basis of their process and product alone. As a result, the budgetary criterion is gradually phased out.

For a school in its third year of operation, the school score is 50% implementation, 40% E-127P, and 10% budget, with the E-127P and budget information again from the year before. Finally, in the fourth and following years, the formula is reduced to 50% implementation (process) and 50% E-127P (product).

5. 1975-75 TIMELINE FOR DISTRICT EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

October:	Pre-tests for E-127P reading and math components
October-April:	MAR visits and assessments by district of other components
December:	First E-127I due
April:	Second E-127I due
May:	Post tests for E-127P language and math components
May 1:	A-127 district application due
July 1:	A-127 school plans due
July 15:	E-127P due